

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

FRANCIS KEISTER,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	No. 3:20-cv-00862
v.)	JUDGE RICHARDSON
)	
AMAZON DHAI1, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Pending before the Court is a Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Doc. No. 31), recommending that Defendant's¹ Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 22) be granted. No Objections to the Report and Recommendation have been filed.²

The failure to object to a report and recommendation releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *Frias v. Frias*, No. 2:18-cv-00076, 2019 WL 549506, at *2 (M.D. Tenn. Feb. 12, 2019); *Hart v. Bee Property Mgmt.*, No. 18-cv-11851, 2019 WL 1242372, at *1 (E.D. Mich. March 18, 2019) (citing *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)). The district court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, those aspects of the report and

¹ Though Amazon DHAI1 is listed separately in the case caption, the Court has previously indicated that the two entities (Amazon DHAI1 and Amazon.com, Inc.) appear to be the same, and that Plaintiff does not appear to maintain separate claims against Amazon DHAI1. (Doc. No. 12 at n.1). Therefore, the Court herein refers to Defendant using the singular.

² Plaintiff filed a Notice of Appeal and a motion for extension of time to pay the associated filing fee three days after the Report and Recommendation was filed. (Doc. No. 33). The Court denied the motion for extension of time to pay the associated filing fee and gave Plaintiff an additional 21 days to respond to the Report and Recommendation, as Plaintiff seemed to misunderstand the process for objecting to the Report and Recommendation. (Doc. No. 34). Instead of thereafter properly objecting, Plaintiff attempted to pay the filing fee associated with her notice of appeal. (Doc. No. 35). The Court ordered the money refunded to Plaintiff. (Doc. No. 36). No objections have been filed regarding the Report and Recommendation.

recommendation to which no objection is made. *Ashraf v. Adventist Health System/Sunbelt, Inc.*, 322 F. Supp. 3d 879, 881 (W.D. Tenn. 2018); *Benson v. Walden Security*, No. 3:18-cv-0010, 2018 WL 6322332, at *3 (M.D. Tenn. Dec. 4, 2018). The district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed. *Id.*

Nonetheless, the Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation and the file. The Report and Recommendation is adopted and approved. Accordingly, Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 22) is **GRANTED**. This action is **DISMISSED**, and the Clerk is directed to close the file. This Order shall constitute the final judgment in this case under Fed. R. Civ. P. 58.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


ELI RICHARDSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE